

## REMARKS

### Summary of the Office Action and Status of the Claims

In the Office Action mailed April 28, 2009, claims 1-5 and 8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,684,088 (Halahmi). Also, claims 6-7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Halahmi in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,928,266 (Nevo), and claims 9-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Halahmi in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,275,850 (Beyda).

Presently, claims 1-10 are pending, of which claim 1 is independent and the other claims are dependent, in one way or another, from claim 1.

### Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Independent claim 1 is generally directed toward a method in which a server receives information content in a first data format, and then determines whether to transform the information content from the first data format to a second data format before sending the information content to a client device.

In particular, the determination may be based on an efficiency with which the client device can process the information content when the information content is stored in the first data format versus when the information content is stored in a second data format, and the transmission capabilities of a wireless communication link associated with the client device. Furthermore, the first data format does not involve the server applying cascading style sheet (CSS) pre-processing to the information content, and the second data format involves the server applying CSS pre-processing to the information content.

Thus, for example, a server may receive a message for the client device in a first format. Then, the server would determine whether to transform the message into a second format, wherein the transforming involves the server applying CSS pre-processing to the message. The server sends the message either in the *original* first format, or in the second format *with CSS pre-processing* to the client device.

This summary of independent claim 1 is for purposes of the following discussion, and is not intended to limit the scope of the claim.

Unlike claim 1, the Halahmi reference is generally directed to a system that receives an email message, but doesn't determine *whether* to convert the message from its original format to a different format before sending the message to a client device. Instead, Halahmi's system determines *how* to convert the message to a different format.

In other words, Halahmi requires conversion of a message, whereas claim 1 recites a method in which information is either converted to a different format (the second data format of claim 1), or transmitted in the original format received by the system (the first data format of claim 1). Halahmi's teachings of transmitting email messages only after the email messages are converted appear throughout Halahmi. *See e.g., Halahmi at Figure 2, step 12; Figure 6A, steps 3-4; col. 1, lines 11-16; col. 3, lines 16-19; col. 3, lines 24-27; col. 4, lines 49-51; col. 6, lines 10-17; col. 9, lines 1-4.*

Thus, by requiring conversion of email messages, Halahmi fails to teach, as recited in claim 1, (1) determining whether to transform information content at a server from a first data format to a second data format, and (2) sending the information content to a client device in the first data format or the second data format. Instead, Halahmi always transforms the information content from a first data format to a second data format, and has no option to send information content in the untransformed first data format.

For this reason, and without conceding any other assertions made in the Office Action, claim 1 is allowable over Halahmi. However, claim 1 is also allowable over Halahmi because Halahmi does not teach a server applying CSS pre-processing to information content prior to transmitting the information content to a client device.

Halahmi discloses CSS at col. 11, lines 55-57. In particular, Halahmi teaches a system that determines "the level of support, if any, which is provided by the microbrowser [on a client device] for HTML, CSS (cascading style sheets), WAP; and so forth." Otherwise, Halahmi is silent with respect to CSS. Thus, Halahmi fails to teach a server applying CSS pre-processing to the information content.

For this reason as well, claim 1 is also allowable over Halahmi. Furthermore, without conceding any other assertions made in the Office Action, dependent claims 2-5 and 8 are also allowable for at least the reason that they depend from an allowable claim.

### **Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Dependent claims 6-7 and 9-10 stand rejected over combinations of Halahmi and other references. However, these claims also depend, in one way or another, from allowable claim 1. Thus, without conceding any other assertions made in the Office Action, dependent claims 6-7 and 9-10 are also allowable for at least the reason that they depend from an allowable claim.

### **Conclusion**

If Examiner believes that further dialog would expedite consideration of the application, Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' representative below at (312) 913-3361 if any questions arise or if he may be of assistance to the Examiner.

**McDonnell Boehnen Hulbert and Berghoff LLP**  
Respectfully Submitted,

Date: July 7, 2009

By: /Michael S. Borella/  
Michael S. Borella  
Reg. No. 62,361